

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 11-18, 20-22, 24-25, 28-35, 37-39, 41-51 and are pending in the application. Claims 1, 18 and 35 are independent. Applicant has amended the claims. Applicant submits that no new matter is added by any of these amendments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the amendments and the remarks contained herein.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 11-14, 16, 18, 20-22, 24-25, 28-31, 33, 35, 37-39, 41-43, 45-48, and 50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over US 2004/0221310 A1 to Herrington, et al. ("Herrington") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,410,344 to Graves, et al. ("Graves").

Claims 1, 18 and 35, as amended, recite "enabling a user to modify the selected title, the modified title being at least one of an abbreviation, a truncation and an expansion of the selected title." At least this claim feature is neither taught nor suggested by Herrington or Graves.

The Examiner cites Herrington Figure 7A as disclosing a user having the option to weight program attributes wherein a user may modify the title by excluding the full program title while maintaining a partial title for a search. However, a thorough reading of the detailed description of the drawings indicates that a user is not given an option to *modify* the title of the program. Rather, when conducting a search, the user is given the option of assigning importance to attributes such as program titles *related* to the selected title:

Configuration display screen 138 shows that importance levels may be assigned to the program attributes for the given episode of Star Trek: The Next Generation so that when locating related program listings, the program guide excludes programs that are Star Trek: The Next Generation, ignores whether a program is a Star Trek program when deciding whether it matches, ignores whether a program is a Star Trek movie when deciding whether it matches, requires matching programs to be science fiction, requires matching programs to have Patrick Stewart. Configuration display screen 138 may include a search option that may provide the user with an opportunity to direct the program guide system to locate program listings related to the given program based on the program attributes and their assigned importance levels. (Herrington, [0065]).

Thus, no combination of Herrington and Graves can teach or suggest Applicant's quoted claim feature. Further, Herrington teaches away from the concept embodied in Graves:

Interactive electronic television program guides ("program guides") typically provide program listings for all channels available in the television system. Some

program guides include features for allowing users to search for programs. Such search features are often complex, time-consuming, and cumbersome. For example, such search features may require that a user select search parameters such as preferred programming genres before searching for programs, that a user navigate through several display screens before being allowed to initiate a search, that the user enter at least a portion of a program title to initiate a search, etc. It is therefore an object of the present invention to provide a television system that includes an improved program searching feature. (Herrington, [0004-0005])

In contrast to this stated objective of Herrington, Graves discloses a complex system requiring the input of a multitude of user preferences.

Thus, neither Herrington nor Graves teaches or suggests "enabling a user to modify the selected title, the modified title being at least one of an abbreviation, a truncation and an expansion of the selected title." Further, there would be no motivation to combine Herrington and Graves. Accordingly, claims 1, 18 and 35 as amended are not obvious over Herrington in view of Graves, whether taken separately or in combination.

Claims 3-5, 7-8, 11-14, 16, 20-22, 24-25, 28-31, 33, 37-39, 41-43, 45-48, and 50 depend upon and add further limitations to independent claims 1, 18 and 35. Accordingly, claims 3-5, 7-8, 11-14, 16, 20-22, 24-25, 28-31, 33, 37-39, 41-43, 45-48, and 50 are not obvious over Herrington in view of Graves, whether taken separately or in combination.

Additionally, claims 15, 32, 44 and 49 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Herrington in view of Graves and U.S. Patent No. 6,567,984 to Allport ("Allport"). As described above, neither Herrington nor Graves teaches or suggests "enabling a user to modify the selected title, the modified title being at least one of an abbreviation, a truncation and an expansion of the selected title." Allport fails to make up for this deficiency.

Allport fails to teach, suggest or even mention any form of title modification. Allport teaches "title" in the context of displaying a CD title on a real-time clock (RTC):

[T]he RTC 315 is used to determine when a particular title or titles from a CD have completed based on the play-time associated with the title or titles. (Col. 15, lines 32-35).

Accordingly, claims 1, 18 and 35 as amended are not obvious in view of Herrington, Graves and Allport, whether taken separately or in combination.

Claims 15, 32, 44 and 49 depend upon and add further limitations to independent claims 1, 18 and 35. Accordingly, claims 15, 32, 44 and 49 are not obvious in view of Herrington, Graves and Allport, whether taken separately or in combination.

Finally, claims 17, 34 and 51 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Herrington in view of Graves and U.S. Patent No. 6,681,396 to Bates ("Bates"). As described above, neither Herrington nor Graves teaches or suggests "enabling a user to modify the selected title, the modified title being at least one of an abbreviation, a truncation and an expansion of the selected title." Bates fails to make up for this deficiency.

Bates fails to teach, suggest or even mention any form of title modification. Bates teaches "title" in the context of displaying information:

As shown in FIG. 6, for example, a dialog box similar to dialog box 110 may be displayed to a user, including the relevant program information for the selected later showing in panel 112, typically identifying the title of the program, and the date, the time and the channel upon which the program may be found. (Col. 7, lines 14-19).

Accordingly, claims 1, 18 and 35 as amended are not obvious in view of Herrington, Graves and Bates, whether taken separately or in combination.

Claims 17, 34 and 51 depend upon and add further limitations to independent claims 1, 18 and 35. Accordingly, claims 17, 34 and 51 are not obvious in view of Herrington, Graves and Bates, whether taken separately or in combination.

#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Dan Kikinis  
Serial No. : 09/752,612  
Filed : December 29, 2000  
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney Docket No. 091451.00124

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

No fee is due at this time. Please charge any fee(s) or credit overpayments to Deposit Account 50/2324.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09/22/06

  
Elizabeth R. Burkhardt  
Reg. No. 58,710

Holland & Knight LLP  
10 St. James Avenue  
Boston, MA 02116  
Tel. 617.573.5805  
Fax 617.523.6850

# 4057970\_v1